

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 2-10 and 15-20 have been withdrawn from consideration. By this Response, claim 1 is amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Vanderwilt, et al. (US 6,693,661). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated in applicant's previous arguments in a Response dated April 13, 2005, the VCU 102 of Vanderwilt acts as a hub for processing data and is not a projector. The projection of images in Vanderwilt is left to external devices such as a LCD projector. Applicants previous arguments intended to elucidate that the embodiments of the present invention as defined by claim 1 provide a projector that produces an image by an optical engine to project the image while also including a network interface and a hub. As noted by the Examiner, the VCU does not teach the projection of an image but this action is performed by a different device. In Vanderwilt's system, the VCU includes a network interface and a network hub. The VCU 102 relies on other devices to form the projection of an image and does not include "an optical engine" as claimed. Vice versa, the projection devices in Vanderwilt's teachings rely on the VCU to perform the actions of the network interface and network hub. The VCU and the projection device in Vanderwilt are two separate devices performing distinct operations.

To clarify the features defined by the embodiment of claim 1, applicants have amended independent claim 1. The projector is now recited as having a main body that includes the optical engine, network interface and hub. Thus, clarification that the projector itself includes the optical engine, network interface and hub as claimed has been provided.

Applicants respectfully submit that Vanderwilt fails to teach, *inter alia*, a projector comprising: a main body, the main body including: an optical engine which projects an image based on a video signal; ...a network interface, through which said circuit section communicates with a remote network terminal device; and a hub which is connected to said network interface, said hub including ports, said network interface being connected to said remote network terminal device through one of said ports, electric power from said power source being supplied to said hub, as recited in independent claim 1.

For the reasons above, applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is distinguishable over the cited reference. Dependent claims 11-14 are also distinguishable over the cited art for the reasons above as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-20 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No.: 10/006,585

Docket No.: 1190-0533P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 15, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By



Michael R. Cammarata

Registration No.: 39,491

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant